

Application Serial No. 10/583,880
Reply to Office Action of July 28, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4890

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated July 28, 2009, the Examiner states that Claims 8-39 are pending and rejected.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9-14 and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Takizawa (US 2004/0245432). Claims 9-16 and 19-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by Maeno et al. (JP 2004-318069). Claims 9-11, 13-16, 19-22, 24-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Oe et al. (JP 2000-109510). Claims 9-13, 15, 19-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Keys et al. (US 4,942,102). Claims 9-12, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Smothers et al. (US 4,917,977) or Laganis et al. (EP 0 437 259). Claims 9-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Yamaguchi et al. (JP 06-175554). Claims 9-15, 18, 19 and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Okubo et al. (US 5,965,324). Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses these rejections.

Also, Claims 9-13, 15, 19-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Keys et al. in view of Monroe (US 5,096,790) and Baum (US 3,652,275). Claims 9-12, 17, 19, 30 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Laganis et al. Claims 9-12, 14, 17, 19 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Kawabata et al. (US 5,453,340) in view of Harada et al. (JP 01-287105). Claims 9-15, 18, 19 and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Okubo et al. in view of Ernst et al. (DE 100571141). Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses these rejections.

As mentioned in the amendment filed December 28, 2009, Applicant indicates that the present application has a foreign priority date of December 22, 2003. However, Takizawa has a US filing date of May 20, 2004, and Maeno et al. has a publication date of November 11, 2004. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the foregoing references are not properly citable as prior art references. Please find a certified translation of the priority document enclosed with this supplemental response.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections


Application Serial No. 10/583,880
Reply to Office Action of July 28, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4890

are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

January 7, 2010
Date

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Eric D. Babych
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 57,542